APR 2 4 2007

## REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated April 28, 2006, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 31-42 and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable by Amini. Claim 45 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Amini in view of Vaios. Claims 31-42, 44 and 45 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 47-62 have been added.

Claim 47 recites, inter alia, "voice-over-Internet-protocol communication session with the outside entity via a communications network in communication with the location, the communications network including at least one of a public switched telephone network, the Internet and a wireless communication link." As described on page 21, line 19 to page 22, line 8, embodiments of the invention establish communication with an outside entity using at least one public communication network. Amini fails to teach at least these features.

Amini uses a private network 340 to establish communications between the client site 310 and the off-site storage site 330. As taught by Amini, the private network increases security features. Amini contrasts the private network 340 with conventional dial up networks in prior art Figure 2 (column 6, lines 13-33). Thus, Amini fails to teach establishing a communication session over a public network.

Further, claim 47 recites that the communication session is a voice-over-Internet-protocol communication session. Amini fails to teach at least this feature. Additionally, claim 47 recites that the triggering event activates an ability to allow control to be assigned to the outside entity. This allows, for example, only an emergency response unit to terminate the call as described on page 23 of Applicants' specification. Again, Amini fails to teach at least this feature.

For at least the above reasons, claim 47 is patentable over Amini. Claims 48-52 depend from claim 47 and are patentable over Amini for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 47.

Independent claims 53 recites features similar to those discussed above with reference

to claim 47. Claims 54-58 depend from claim 53 and are patentable over Amini for at least the reasons advance with reference to claim 47.

Independent claim 59 recites, *inter alia*, "a control module allowing an outside entity to control the operations of the devices associated with a local area network; wherein the devices include VoIP capable devices and television." Amini fails to teach at least these elements of claim 59. For at least the above reasons, claim 59 is patentable over Amini.

Claims 60-62 depend from claim 59 and are patentable over Amini for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 59.

For at least the reasons advanced above, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested. The Examiner is cordially requested to telephone, if the Examiner believes that it would be advantageous to the disposition of this case.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment, which may be required for this amendment, to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or may be required in addition to that requested in any petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

David A. Fox

Registration No. 38,807 CANTOR COLBURN LLP 55 Griffin Road South Bloomfield, CT 06002 Telephone (860) 286-2929 Facsimile (860) 286-0115

Customer No. 36192

Date: April 24, 2007